APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/985,879	11/06/2001	Joseph Nardone	003636.0126	4505

7590   12/09/2005

Attn: William H. Bollman
Manelli Denison & Selter PLLC
2000 M Street, NW
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20016

EXAMINER
TRAN, QUOC A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 12/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/985,879	NARDONE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Quoc A. Tran	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>20 September 2005</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-57* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-57* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: RCE filed on 09/20/2005 and Amendment

filed on 06/21/2005, which claim benefit of 60/245,713 and 60/245,677 60/245,678 filed on

11/06/2000 to the original application filed 11/06/2001.

2.   Claims 1-57 are pending. Applicant amended claims 3-4, 12-13, 18, 20-29, 32-33, 36, 38, 41-45

and added new claims 46-57. Claims 1, 12, 19, 30, 41, 46, 50 and 54 are independent claims.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

3.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in

37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is

eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e)

has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to

37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 06/21/2005 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-45 have been considered but are moot in

view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Regarding to Applicant's arguments directed toward the un-amended claims (i.e.

dependent claims 1-2, 5-11, 14-17, 19, 31, and 39-40). It is noted, that Hawkins US006000000A

filed 05/04/1998, Hawkins US006330618B1 filed 05/25/1999 and Pajakowski US006718425B1 filed

05/31/2000, fairly teach and/or suggest the claims' limitations (set forth in the Advisory Action

Reponses to request for reconsideration mail on 07/05/2005), however are moot in view of the

new ground(s) of rejection necessitates by Applicants amended and newly added claims set forth

below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6.   Claims 1-18 and 41-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is

directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-18 and 41-49 set forth non-functional

descriptive material but fail to set forth physical structures or materials comprising of hardware

or a combination of hardware and software within the technological arts (i.e. a computer) to

produce a "useful, concrete and tangible" result. For example, claims 1-18 and 41-49 the

"method" reads on a mental construct/abstract idea or at best a computer program, per se. The

language such as " A method of creating conduits for synchronizations comprising: ..., does not

clearly define structural elements and are not tangibly embodied on a computer readable

medium. Claims 1-18 and 41-49 are interpreted as software per se, abstract ideas or mental

construct and not tangibly embodied on a computer readable medium or hardware.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.   Claims 1-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Hawkins et al. US

Patent No. 6,000,000 - filed 05/04/1998 (hereinafter Hawkins '000), in view of Robertson

US20010047441A1- Non-Provisional of Provisional 60/184,344 – filed 02/23/2000 (hereinafter

Robertson '441), further in view of Smith " The Multi-Boot Configuration Handbook" Publisher: Que

ISBN: 0-7897-2283-6 – USA- Published 03/29/2000 (hereinafter Smith), US Patent No. 6,718,425 B1

issued 04/06/2004 filed 05/31/2000 (hereinafter '425).

In regard to independent claim 1, generating a first graphical user interface, (as

taught by Hawkins '000 at col. 3, line 50 through col.4, line 50, also see Fig. 1 discloses an extendible

method and apparatus for synchronizing multiple files on two different computers system, includes hand

help computer system (item 110), a personal computer system (item 150) and a display representing

computer system calendar program (item 115) and a mouse) Examiner read the above in the broadest

reasonable interpretation to the claim limitation, wherein graphical user interface would have

been an obvious variant of a personal computer system (item 150) and a display representing computer

system calendar program (item 115) and a mouse) to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made,

selecting a first database and a second database and second database on said first

graphical user interface (as taught by Hawkins '000 at col. 3, line 50 through col. 6, line 5, also see

Fig.1- Fig.4 discloses an extendible method and apparatus for synchronizing multiple files on two

different computers system, includes hand help computer system (item 110), a personal computer system

(item 150) and a display representing computer system calendar program (item 115) and a mouse,

includes the conduit libraries, wherein the synchronization system of Hawkins '000 is extendible

such that it can also reconcile several other databases under control of a single synchronization

system that can be started with a single key press),

mapping at least one field of said first database to a corresponding field of said

second database in a map file; (Hawkins '000 at col.5, lines 10-40, also Fig. 4, discloses a sync

manager library (item 410) the data between several different independent applications with

different associated databases which run on the handheld computer system and the personal

computer system. The sync manager dynamic link library, and conduit libraries operate to

perform the synchronization of handheld applications A-C (items 471-473) with PC Applications

A-C (items 481-483) associated with different Databases A-C (items 441-443)) Examiner read

the above in the broadest reasonable interpretation to the claim limitation, wherein map file and

mapping of databases would have been an obvious variant of The sync manager dynamic link

library, and conduit libraries operate to perform the synchronization of handheld applications A-

C (items 471-473) with PC Applications A-C (items 481-483) associated with different

Databases A-C (items 441-443) to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made,

programming a conduit with said map file, (Hawkins '000 at col. 15, lines 1-25, also

Fig. 4, discloses the hotsync memory resident program first consults a sync registry that contains

a list of conduit libraries that are used to synchronize different applications on the personal

computer system and the palmtop computer system) Examiner read the above in the broadest

reasonable interpretation to the claim limitation, wherein map file would have been an obvious

variant of a sync registry that contains a list of conduit libraries that are used to synchronize to a

person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Hawkins '000 does not explicitly teach, **executing said conduit with said map file in response to a synchronization request**, however (Robertson '441 page 4 paragraph [0057] through page 6 paragraph [0070], also see Fig. 6-7 discloses a communication system conduit for transferring data in the communication network, wherein FIG. 7 shows a sample user menu screen which prompts the user to chose the appropriate peripheral device (item 12) for data communication (i.e. data download or upload). As shown, the user may choose a number of options, namely PDA at step (208), laptop at step (210) and a multimedia device at step (212), being either a MPEG/MPG device at step (214), camera at step (216), or video at step (218) (FIG. 7). Once the user has selected the type of device that they wish to conduct the data transfer with, they are presented with another menu (not shown) which instructs them to choose a particular data format (i.e. since some devices have multi-format capabilities) Examiner read the above in the broadest reasonable interpretation to the claim limitation, wherein map file in response to a synchronization request would have been an obvious variant of a sample user menu screen which prompts the user to chose the appropriate peripheral device (item 12) for data communication (i.e. data download or upload) to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teaching of Hawkins '000, generating a first graphical user interface for selecting a first database and a second database for mapping at least one field of said first database to a corresponding field of said second database in a map file and programming a conduit with said map file, further to include a mean of executing said conduit with said map file in response to a synchronization request of Robertson '441 teaching. One of

ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide

user the ability to synchronize a communications system conduit for matching the data between

different API that associated with different databases using single synchronization command

(as taught by Hawkins at col. 1 line 30 through col. 2, line 61).

Hawkins '000 and Robertson '441 do not explicitly teach, **wherein said conduit**

provides synchronization rules from said map file for said first database and said second

database, however (Smith at Chapter 19 pages 1-23 and Chapter 17 pages 62-79, also Fig. 19.1-

19.3 discloses the method of using FTP for cross-platform data exchange, wherein the two sides

of FTP are client and server, also utilizing telnet (Tele communication networking) or SSH

(Secure Shell), remote GUI (Graphical User Interface) control in the X-Window System, Virtual

Network Computing (VNC) program and a method of modifying GUI look and feel for GUI

add-ons for Windows, OS/2, BeOS. Further more on page 14 in third paragraph Smith discloses

the means of using FTP such as, sending, requesting and /or accepting files between two

computers or server/client networking environment. In some sense this is what most networking

protocols do: exchange files. Many other protocols also filter and process files in various ways,

but in an FTP exchange, the files usually transfer from one computer's hard disk to the other

computer's hard disk) Examiner read the above in the broadest reasonable interpretation to the

claim limitation, wherein a first database and a second database and conduit provides

synchronization rules would have been an obvious variant of from one computer's hard disk to

the other computer's hard disk and using FTP such as, sending, requesting and /or accepting files

between two computers or server/client networking environment to a person of ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made, also (Smith at Chapter 19 pages 1-23 and Chapter 17

pages 62-79, illustrating in Fig. 19.3, an xmFTP witch is one of many GUIFTP clients wherein

when connected, most GUI FTP clients present a list of local files in one window or one side of a

window (the left pane in Fig. 19.3) and a list of remote files in another window or pane (the

right pane in Fig. 19.3) and cross-platform application includes a description of using a text-

based FTP client program and transfer a file by clicking the file you want and choosing a transfer

menu item or toolbar icon) Examiner read the above in the broadest reasonable interpretation to

the claim limitation, wherein a conduit and mapping file would have been an obvious variant of

telnet with ftp and GUI FTP clients present a list of local files in one window or one side of a

window (the left pane in Fig. 19.3) and a list of remote files in another window or pane (the

right pane in Fig. 19.3) to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified the teaching of Hawkins '000, generating a first graphical

user interface for selecting a first database and a second database for mapping at least one field

of said first database to a corresponding field of said second database in a map file and

programming a conduit with said map file, further to include a mean of executing said conduit

with said map file in response to a synchronization request of Robertson '441 teaching, and

further to include a means of provides synchronization rules from said map file for said first

database and said second database in a conduit of Smith's teaching . One of ordinary skill in the

art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide user the ability to

synchronize a communications system conduit for matching the data between different API

(Application Interface) that associated with different databases using single synchronization

command (as taught by Hawkins at col. 1 line 30 through col. 2, line 61).

In regard to independent claims 12, 19, 30 and 41, incorporate substantially similar

subject matter as cited in claim 1 above, and in further view of the following, and is similarly

rejected along the same rationale, using the broadest the reasonable interpretation to the claims

limitation Examiner read, **configuring a conduit with a graphical user interface to**

synchronize a first database and a second database, initiating a synchronize requested ..., a

plurality of mapping files associated with a plurality of databases; a configurable conduit

programmed with a graphical user interface to synchronize... would have been an obvious

variant of generating a first graphical user interface, selecting a first database and a second

database and second database on said first graphical user interface mapping at least one field of

said first database to a corresponding field of said second database in a map file programming a

conduit with said map file executing said conduit with said map file in response to a

synchronization request wherein said conduit provides synchronization rules from said map file

for said first database and said second database and further view of the following,

Hawkins '000 at col. 15, lines 1-25, also Fig. 4, discloses the hotsync memory resident

program first consults a sync registry that contains a list of conduit libraries that are used to

synchronize different applications on the personal computer system and the palmtop computer

system) Examiner read the above in the broadest reasonable interpretation to the claim limitation,

wherein a plurality of map files would have been an obvious variant of a sync registry that

contains a list of conduit libraries that are used to synchronize to a person of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made.

In regard to independent claims 46 and 54, incorporate substantially similar subject

matter as cited in claim 1 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent claim 50, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as

cited in claim 1 above, and further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same

rationale. Using the broadest the reasonable interpretation to the claims limitation Examiner read,

a selector to select would have been an obvious variant of GUI (Graphical User Interface) to a

person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

In regard to dependent claim 2, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as

cited in claims 1, 41 and 50 above, and further view of the following, and is similarly rejected

along the same rationale,

and importing said other one of said first database and said second database in

response to selection of said first database and said second database (as taught by Hawkins

'000 at col. 5, lines 25-40, i.e. The sync manager library 410 implements a library of functions

that are made available to other programs for synchronizing databases. To communicate with

the handheld computer 110 the sync manager library 410 also uses the communication link

code such as communication link X code 451 that controls communication link X 411... the

sync manager library 410 oversees the synchronization process and uses individual "Conduit"

libraries to perform the synchronization of each database...).

In regard to dependent claim 3, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as

cited in claim 1 above, and further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the

same rationale,

wherein said one of said first database and said second database is a client application database and ~~said~~ <u>an</u> other ~~one~~ of said first database and said second database is an enterprise application database, however (Smith at Chapter 19 pages 1-23 and Chapter 17 pages 62-79, also Fig. 19.1- 19.3 discloses the method of using FTP for cross-platform data exchange, wherein the two sides of FTP are client and server).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teaching of Hawkins '000, generating a first graphical user interface for selecting a first database and a second database for mapping at least one field of said first database to a corresponding field of said second database in a map file and programming a conduit with said map file, further to include a mean of executing said conduit with said map file in response to a synchronization request of Robertson '441 teaching, and further to include a means of provides synchronization rules from said map file for said first database (e.g. client) and said second database (e.g. server) in a conduit of Smith's teaching . One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide user the ability to synchronize a communications system conduit for matching the data between different API (Application Interface) that associated with different databases using single synchronization command (as taught by Hawkins at col. 1 line 30 through col. 2, line 61).

In regard to dependent claim 4, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 1 above, and further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale,

   generating a second graphical user interface, however (Smith at Chapter 19 pages 1-

23 and Chapter 17 pages 62-79, illustrating in Fig. 19.3, an xmFTP witch is one of many

GUIFTP clients wherein when connected, most GUI FTP clients present a list of local files in

one window or one side of a window (the left pane in Fig. 19.3) and a list of remote files in

another window or pane (the right pane in Fig. 19.3) and cross-platform application includes a

description of using a text-based FTP client program and transfer a file by clicking the file you

want and choosing a transfer menu item or toolbar icon).

   It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified the teaching of Hawkins '000, generating a first graphical

user interface for selecting a first database and a second database for mapping at least one field

of said first database to a corresponding field of said second database in a map file and

programming a conduit with said map file, further to include a mean of executing said conduit

with said map file in response to a synchronization request of Robertson '441 teaching, and

further to include a means of generating a second graphical user interface and synchronization

rules from said map file for said first database (e.g. client) and said second database (e.g.

server) in a conduit of Smith's teaching . One of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to perform such a modification to provide user the ability to synchronize a

communications system conduit for matching the data between different API (Application

Interface) that associated with different databases using single synchronization command (as

taught by Hawkins at col. 1 line 30 through col. 2,

line 61).

In regard to dependent claim 5, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1-2 and 4 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 6, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1-2, 4 and 5 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 7, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1-2, and 4-6 above, and in further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale,

generating a third graphical user interface, however (Smith at Chapter 19 pages 1-23 and Chapter 17 pages 62-79, illustrating in Fig. 19.3, an xmFTP witch is one of many GUIFTP clients wherein when connected, most GUI FTP clients present a list of local files in one window or one side of a window (the left pane in Fig. 19.3) and a list of remote files in another window or pane (the right pane in Fig. 19.3) and cross-platform application includes a description of using a text-based FTP client program and transfer a file by clicking the file you want and choosing a transfer menu item or toolbar icon).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teaching of Hawkins '000, generating a first graphical user interface for selecting a first database and a second database for mapping at least one field of said first database to a corresponding field of said second database in a map file and programming a conduit with said map file, further to include a mean of executing said conduit with said map file in response to a synchronization request of Robertson '441 teaching, and further to include a means of generating a third graphical user interface and synchronization rules from said map file for said first database (e.g. client) and said second database (e.g.

server) in a conduit of Smith's teaching . One of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to perform such a modification to provide user the ability to synchronize a

communications system conduit for matching the data between different API (Application

Interface) that associated with different databases using single synchronization command (as

taught by Hawkins at col. 1 line 30 through col. 2,

line 61).

In regard to dependent claim 8, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited

in claims 1-2, and 4-7 above, and in further view of the following, and is similarly rejected

along the same rationale,

deleting said rule from said set of rules, however (Smith at Chapter 19 pages 1-23 and

Chapter 17 pages 62-79, illustrating in Fig. 19.1, GUI tools enable and/or disable FTP service by

checking appropriate configuration) Examiner read the above in the broadest reasonable

interpretation to the claim limitation, wherein deleting said rule from said set of rules would have

been an obvious variant of disable FTP service by checking appropriate configuration (e.g.

Delete radio button) to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified the teaching of Hawkins '000, generating a first graphical

user interface for selecting a first database and a second database for mapping at least one field

of said first database to a corresponding field of said second database in a map file and

programming a conduit with said map file, further to include a mean of executing said conduit

with said map file in response to a synchronization request of Robertson '441 teaching, and

further to include a means of generating a third graphical user interface and synchronization

rules from said map file for said first database (e.g. client) and said second database (e.g.

server) in a conduit of Smith's teaching . One of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to perform such a modification to provide user the ability to synchronize a

communications system conduit for matching the data between different API (Application

Interface) that associated with different databases using single synchronization command (as

taught by Hawkins at col. 1 line 30 through col. 2,

line 61).

In regard to dependent claim 9, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited

in claims 1-2, and 4-7 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 10, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as

cited in claims 1-2, and 4-8 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 11, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as

cited in claims 1-2, and 4-10 above, and in further view of the following, and is similarly

rejected along the same rationale,

saving said set of rules as said map file (as taught by Hawkins '000 at col. 11,

lines 40-45, Instructs the handheld computer system to locate and retrieve the information then

store it in the passed structure. The calling client Conduit library must allocate enough memory

in the general data area to hold the responding information...).

In regard to independent claim 13, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as

cited in claims 1-2 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent claim 14, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as

cited in claim 2 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 15, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as

cited in claims 1, 41 and 50 above, and further view of the following, and is similarly rejected

along the same rationale,

displaying a plurality of fields of said first database and a plurality of fields of said

second database within a display element of said first graphical user interface, however

(Smith at Chapter 19 pages 1-23 and Chapter 17 pages 62-79, illustrating in Fig. 19.1 and 19.3,

an xmFTP witch is one of many GUIFTP clients wherein when connected, most GUI FTP

clients present a list of local files in one window or one side of a window (the left pane in Fig.

19.3) and a list of remote files in another window or pane (the right pane in Fig. 19.3) and

cross-platform application includes a description of using a text-based FTP client program and

transfer a file by clicking the file you want and choosing a transfer menu item or toolbar icon).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified the teaching of Hawkins '000, generating a first graphical

user interface for selecting a first database and a second database for mapping at least one field

of said first database to a corresponding field of said second database in a map file and

programming a conduit with said map file, further to include a mean of executing said conduit

with said map file in response to a synchronization request of Robertson '441 teaching, and

further to include a means of displaying a plurality of fields of said first database and a plurality

of fields of said second database within a display element of said first graphical user interface,

and synchronization rules from said map file for said first database (e.g. client) and said second

database (e.g. server) in a conduit of Smith's teaching . One of ordinary skill in the art would

have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide user the ability to synchronize a

communications system conduit for matching the data between different API (Application Interface) that associated with different databases using single synchronization command (as taught by Hawkins at col. 1 line 30 through col. 2, line 61).

In regard to dependent claim 16, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 8 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 17, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 7, 9, and 10 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 18, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 11 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 20, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1-2, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 21, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 3, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 22-29 consecutively, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 4-11 consecutively, and are similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 31, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1-2, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 32, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 3, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 33-40 consecutively, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 4-11 consecutively, and are similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to claim 42, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1-2, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 43-44, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 3, and are similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 45, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1, 41 and 50 above, and further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale,

overwrite of data between a first database and a second database, however (Smith at Chapter 19 pages 1-23 and Chapter 17 pages 62-79, also Fig. 19.1- 19.3 discloses the method of using FTP for cross-platform data exchange. In some sense this is what most networking protocols do: exchange files. Many other protocols also filter and process files in various ways, but in an FTP exchange, the files usually transfer from one computer's hard disk to the other computer's hard disk) Examiner read the above in the broadest reasonable interpretation to the claim limitation, wherein overwrite of data between a first database and a second database, would have been an obvious variant of data exchange from one computer's hard disk to the other computer's hard disk to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teaching of Hawkins '000, generating a first graphical user interface for selecting a first database and a second database for mapping at least one field

of said first database to a corresponding field of said second database in a map file and

programming a conduit with said map file, further to include a mean of executing said conduit

with said map file in response to a synchronization request of Robertson '441 teaching, and

further to include a means of generating a third graphical user interface and synchronization

rules from said map file for said first database (e.g. client) and said second database (e.g.

server) in a conduit of Smith's teaching . One of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to perform such a modification to provide user the ability to synchronize a

communications system conduit for matching the data between different API (Application

Interface) that associated with different databases using single synchronization command (as

taught by Hawkins at col. 1 line 30 through col. 2, line 61).

In regard to dependent claim 51, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as

cited in claim 1 above, and further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same

rationale. Using the broadest the reasonable interpretation to the claims limitation Examiner read,

a mapper to map would have been an obvious variant of GUI (Graphical User Interface) to a

person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

In regard to dependent claims 47-49, and 52-53, incorporate substantially similar

subject matter as cited in claims 1-3 and 51, and are similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 55-57, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as

cited in claims 1-3, 50 and 54, and are similarly rejected along the same rationale.

Conclusion

9.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Quoc A. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-4103. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9 AM to 5 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Herndon R. Heather can be reached on (571) -272-4136. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Quoc A, Tran
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2176
December 2, 2005

WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
12/7/2005